

Application No.: 10/725,197

9

Docket No.: 324212003700

REMARKS**Claim Status**

Claims 1-59 are pending in this application. The Examiner indicates claims 1-59 are rejected.

Rejection of claims 1-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious under Zamir et al. ("Zamir"), US 2005/0240580. Claims 1, 21, and 31 are amended to now recite "said relevancy scores are based on behavior of a plurality of users." This is fully supported by the specification (see Fig. 1, and paragraphs [0020]-[0021]). No new matter is added.

In contrast, Zamir discloses relevancy based on individual user preference according to the personal user profile of the specific user requesting a search, and not based on the "behavior of a plurality of users." Zamir discloses that "a set of placed content that matches the interest of the user is identified, and the set of placed content is ordered in accordance with the user profile." (Emphasis added) (Zamir, paragraph [0010])

A user profile comprises multiple items that characterize a user's interests or preferences. These items are extracted from various information sources, including previous search queries submitted by the user, links from or to the documents identified by the previous queries, sampled content from the identified documents as well as personal information implicitly or explicitly provided by the user. (Zamir, paragraph [0011]) (emphasis added)

Furthermore, Zamir teaches away from using the "behavior of a plurality of users" to provide candidate search terms:

However, if the user's preference is significantly biased by some personal factors that are not clearly reflected in a search query itself, or if the user's preference is quite different from the random user's preference, the search results from the same

sf-2115543

Application No.: 10/725,197

10

Docket No.: 324212003700

search engine may be less useful to the user, if not useless.
(Zamir, paragraph [0007])

Using the teaching of Zamir thus discourages using the "behavior of a plurality of users" to determine relevancy scores in order to provide the candidate search terms, as recited in claims 1, 21 and 31. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 21, and 31 are allowable over Zamir.

For at least the foregoing, claims 2-20, 22-30, and 32-59, which are dependent from claims 1, 21 and 31, are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejections to claims 1-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested for claims 1-59.

sf-2115543

Application No.: 10/725,197

11

Docket No.: 324212003700

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 324212003700. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: May 19, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Katherine D. Lee

Registration No.: 44,865

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

425 Market Street

San Francisco, California 94105

(415) 268-6983

sf-2115543